FBIS-SOV-85-226
Friday
22 November 1985
Vol III No 226 Supp 014

Supplement

Daily Report

SOVIET UNION

REAGAN - GORBACHEV

SUMMIT

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

FBIS **DAILY REPORT**

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 226 *22 Nov 85*

PRAVDA REPORTS GORBACHEV PRESS CONFERENCE

REPORTAGE ON REAGAN-GORBACHEV SUMMIT MEETING

PRAVDA Publishes Joint Summit Statement *[22 Nov]* 1
Correspondents Describe Geneva Final Ceremony *[Bolshakov, Dubrovin in PRAVDA 22 Nov]* 2
Reagan Speech Carried Live on Moscow Television 3
Gorbachev Briefs Warsaw Pact Leaders on Summit 4
Met by Husak in Prague 4
Welcoming Party Includes Grishin 4
Gorbachev Meets With Husak *[PRAVDA 22 Nov]* 4
Warsaw Pact Meeting *[PRAVDA 22 Nov]* 4
Pact Leaders Depart 5
Gorbachev Leaves Prague 5
Moscow Arrival 5
Shultz Describes Joint Statement as 'First Step' 6
Warnke Praises Summit, Decries U.S. Arms Stand 6
Arbatov Appraises Impact of Soviet Stand on SDI *[London BBC Television]* 6
Leaders Agree on the Need To Improve Relations *[Zorin]* 7
Leaders, Organizations Evaluate Results of Talks 7
NATO Voices 'Satisfaction' 7
Korniyenko Briefs Mitterrand 7
Mitterrand Welcomes Results 7
CSSR Envoy Stresses Importance 8
Nakasone Assessment 8
Sweden Hails Further Dialogue 8
Accord Encourages Netherlands 8
Sinowatz Endorses Regular Talks 8
Marchais: 'Great Prospects' 9
Mies Hopes for Continuation 9
Natta: 'Little More Hopeful' 9
WPC Head Sees 'Fresh Hope' 9
Iranian Elements 'Openly' Want Talks To Fail *[Lebedeva]* 9

PRAVDA Reports Gorbachev Press Conference
PM221027 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 85
Second Edition pp 1-3

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev's Press Conference"]

[Text] M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, held a press conference in the Soviet press center in Geneva on 21 November, for journalists covering the Soviet-U.S. meeting.

Addressing representatives of the mass media, M.S. Gorbachev said:

Our talks with the President of the United States of America, the first in 6 and 1/2 years, have just ended. This is undoubtedly a significant event in international life. The significance of the meeting will become even clearer if you bear in mind not only Soviet-U.S. relations, but also international relations in general, which are going through a special and, I would say, difficult period.

First, a few words about what went before the Geneva meeting. It was awaited impatiently throughout the world. People pinned great hopes on it for the improvement of the world situation and the lessening of international tension, which is reaching a dangerous level. True, doubts were also expressed: as to whether the confrontation between the two powers had gone too far for it to be possible to count on any accords at all. All this was the case, and you know it as well as we do.

As for the Soviet side, the Soviet Union, we were well aware of the real situation and did not entertain the slightest illusions about U.S. policy. We saw how far the militarization of the economy and even of political thinking had gone in that country.

But we were well aware that the situation in the world is too dangeorus to neglect even the slightest chance of rectifying the situation and advancing toward a more stable and lasting peace.

Even during the run-up, for several months before the meeting, we had already begun, so to speak, to pave the way to the meeting and create a favorable climate for it. Back in the summer we unilaterally halted all nuclear explosions, expressing the readiness to resume talks immediately on completely ending nuclear tests. We also confirmed the unilateral moratorium on testing antisatellite weapons and, as you know, put forward radical proposals for reducing nuclear arsneals Our proposals to prevent the arms race from being transferred to space were accompanied by proposals on launching the broadest possible international cooperation on the peaceful exploration and use of space for the good of all the peoples.

I repeat, we did everything possible to lay the foundations for mutual understanding and improve the political atmosphere even before the meeting. During the run-up to the Geneva summit meeting, a session of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee was held in Sofia, at which the voice of the socialist countries rang out strongly in defense of peace, the relaxation of tension, and cooperation, against the arms race, against confrontation, and for the improvement of the international situation in the interests of all the earth's peoples.

And although these steps of ours, dictated by a sense of responsibility for the fate of peace, did not meet with a due response from our partners in the forthcoming talks in Geneva, we adhered firmly to a constructive position. We considered it necessary to try by force of arguments, by force of example, by force of common sense, to break the dangerous course of events. The very complexity of the international situation convinced us that a direct conversation with the U.S. President is necessary. By virtue of the enormous role which both the Soviet Union and the United States play, there naturally arises the enormous responsibility of these states and their political leaders. This was our conclusion: The time has come when, under the threat of the universal nuclear danger, it is necessary to learn the great art of living together. Both our Soviet people and, I am profoundly convinced, the U.S. people have an equal interest in this. All the peoples of the world have an interest in it.

We were and are aware of the mood of the peoples in all countries in favor of peace, their desire not only to preserve peace, but also to improve the situation and achieve real progress in the struggle to end the arms race. This desire is growing and is of tremendous significance. Two significant conclusions can be drawn from it.

On the one hand — and this was a source of inspiration to us — what we are doing meets the hopes and aspirations of vast masses of people in the world, regardless of where they live or what political views, religious convictions, or traditions they have. On the other hand, it was not only a source of inspiration, it also imposed great obligations on us, above all an obligation to responsibility.

How can the present stage in the development of the international situation be characterized? To put it concisely: Growing responsibility for the future of the world. And this tremendous responsibility is understood by the peoples, and they are acting in the ways available to them.

It follows from this that this situation, this characterization, must nurture the policy of states and the practical actions of politicians. The absence of a policy adequate to the urgent needs felt by all the peoples of the world cannot be made good by propagandist packaging. The peoples have now learned to understand everything quickly and to put everything in its place.

That is my profound conviction. I and my colleagues in the Soviet Union and in the country's political leadership, seeing the situation in precisely that way, have focused our attention in a constructive direction, on the quest for ways to a better, more tranquil world.

The letters I have received from the Soviet Union, the United States, Australia, Europe, Asia, and Africa have made a tremendous impression on me — letters from children, women, men, veterans. It is important to stress that the young people of the whole planet have also actively raised their voice in these letters. Those to whom the future belongs, those who are embarking on life, are taking on their shoulders the responsibility for the future of the world.

Now for the meeting itself.

A considerable place was occupied by face-to-face conversations with President Reagan. Just now, when the U.S. President and I said good-bye, we wanted to calculate how many times we met one-on-one. We arrived at a figure of five or six. As a rule they were hour-long conversations, sometimes more. That is not merely arithmetic. The meetings were frank, prolonged, and blunt — at times extremely blunt [ostryy]. Nonetheless, it seems to me, they were to some extent productive. Of course, considerably more time was devoted to them than planned. I would say that they occupied the main time during these 2 days.

This enables us to discuss a wide range of problems face to face. The conversations took place in the language of politics, an open, forthright language, and I think that this was not only of great significance, but, I would say, decisive.

Above all, at these conversations, and also at the plenary sessions and in broad contacts between all members of the delegations and experts at the corresponding levels — and they were represented on the Soviet and U.S. sides by people of authority, well known not only in our countries, but throughout the world — all this taken together made it possible to do substantial work in the 2 days.

We presented to the President our considerations, our evaluation of the world situation. The starting point of our analysis is this: In recent decades radical changes have taken place in the world which require a new approach, a fresh look at many things in foreign policy. The present international situation is characterized by a very important feature which both we and the United States must take into account in our foreign policy. What I mean is this: In present conditions it is not only a question of confrontation between the two social systems, but of a choice between survival and mutual destruction.

In other words, the objective course of the world process itself places the questions of war and peace, questions of survival, at the center of world politics. I wish to stress that I am specially using the word "survival" not in order to dramatize the situation and inspire fear, but in order to ensure that we all feel deeply and are aware of the realities of today's world.

The problem of war and peace is a priority problem, a burning issue which affects the interests of all of us who live on earth. I would like to stress that this problem has moved to the center of world politics. We cannot avoid seeking solutions to this vital problem. We are convinced of that. That is the Soviet people's will, that is the will of the U.S. people and of all peoples. That is the first thing.

The second thing: Again we drew the U.S. side's attention to the following circumstances — of which I have already spoken. They are circumstances of such importance, and we attach such major significance to them, that we deemed it necessary to speak of them again at the Geneva meeting; namely, it is a fact that even now it is very difficult for us to embark on a productive dialogue and talks on questions of ending the arms race and nuclear disarmament. Tomorrow it will be even more difficult to do so.

That is why the meeting was necessary and responsible dialogue was necessary. We have all reached the point where we have to stop, look arcund, think, and on the basis of the realities, on the basis of a broad approach to the definition of national interests, decide what to do next in the world. In the course of the meetings and conversations, I wished to understand what is the present U.S. Administration's position on this cardinal question — the question of war and peace.

We have all read a great deal about this. And you journalists, in general, have also said a great deal on this score. But for those who take the decisions, it is important to understand the initial, starting point in the formation of our partner's policy, the initial idea behind the present U.S. Administration's foreign policy. Much work and effort were required in order to evaluate everything without prejudice, with a great sense of responsibility, and taking a broad view, and to find an answer to this very important question.

This analysis showed that for all the difference in the side's approaches and the evaluations which were revealed in the course of this serious and necessary work — without having done it, we could not have gone to the meeting — we saw that we have, it seems to me, something in common which could form the starting point for an improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations: the awareness that nuclear war is impermissible, that it must not be waged, and that there can be no winners in such a war. This idea was expressed more than once both on our side and on the U.S. side. The conclusion that follows from this is that the central problem in relations between our countries at the present stage is the problem of security. We resolutely advocate that agreements be reached ensuring identical security for both countries.

We believe that on this basis it will be possible to achieve a consistent strengthening of mutual trust, an overall improvement of the political atmosphere, in which it is possible to hope for the development of political dialogue and the fruitful discussion of economic and humanitarian problems, the problems of contacts and mutual information. This is the key to the problem of preserving life on earth and changing the atmosphere in the direction of good will.

We told the President that we have not sought and will not strive for military superiority over the United States. Moreover, more than once, face to face and at the plenary sessions, I tried to express our profound conviction that a lower level of security for the United States compared with the Soviet Union would be disadvantageous to us, because it would lead to distrust and give rise to instability. We are counting on a similar U.S. approach as regards our country. At the same time we told the President that in no event will we permit the United States to obtain military superiority over us. It seems to me that this is a logical way of putting it. Both sides must get used to strategic parity as the natural state of Soviet-U.S. relations. If we are to talk about anything, it must be about how to lower the level of that parity by mutual efforts; in other words, to implement real measures to reduce nuclear arms on a reciprocal basis. That is a field of activity worthy of the leaders of such great states as the Soviet Union and the United States, and of other state leaders, since it is a common issue for us.

But another conclusion of fundamental significance also arises quite logically from this. Neither of us, neither the United States nor the Soviet Union, should do anything to open the doors to an arms race in new spheres, specifically in space. If the doors into space were opened for weapons, the scale of military rivalry would increase immeasurably and the arms race would — this can already be predicted to some extent — take on an irreversible character and get out of control. In this case each side would at any moment have the feeling that it is losing in some respect and it would start feverishly seeking more and more new ways of responding; and that would whip up the arms race all the time, not only in space, but also on earth, since the responses need not necessarily be in the same sphere. The need only be effective.

I am reasoning in the way I reasoned when I spoke with the President. If this situation arises, then, I repeat, the possibility of any kind of agreement on restraining military rivalry and the arms race will become highly problematical. I wish to go back to what I have already said: The present time is characterized by the fact that we have reached a certain point. And if we do not think and consider in a truly responsible way, then as a result of incorrect, erroneous conclusions on the part of politicians, steps could be taken which will result in grave consequences for all the peoples.

Of course, differences will remain between our countries. Rivalry will also persist. But it is necessary to ensure that it does not go beyond the bounds of the permissible, does not lead to military confrontation. Let each of the social systems demonstrate its advantages by means of setting an example.

We are well aware not only of the weak points, but of the strong points of U.S. society and of the other developed countries. We know their achievements and their potential. Naturally, we know our own potential better, including our unrealized potential. In a word, we are in favor of competition with the United States, active competition. History itself, and not merely theoretical considerations and reasonings, has confirmed the viability of the policy of peaceful coexistence.

In the development of mutual relations between the USSR and the United States, much depends on how each side perceives the world around it. Here, it seems to us, it is particularly important to have a clear understanding of historical realities and to take them into account in forming policy. In this case I have in mind both the Soviet and the U.S. leadership.

The world today is a highly multifaceted conglomeration of sovereign countries and peoples with their own interests, their own desires, their own policy, traditions, and dreams. Many of them have only just embarked on the path of independent development. Their first steps are taking place in incredibly difficult conditions left over from colonialism, from foreign dependence. Some of them, having achieved political independence, want to secure economic independence. They see that they have resources and manpower; that is, they have what they need to secure a better life in an appropriate labor process. These are vast continents. The desire of every people to realize its sovereign right in the political sphere, the economic sphere, and the social sphere is a natural desire.

People may like or dislike this policy, but it reflects internal processes in each particular country, the interests of a particular people, who have a sovereign right. The right to choose — to choose their path, system, methods, forms, to choose their friends — that is the right of every people. If we do not acknowledge that, I do not know how we can build international relations.

When I visited Britain last December, I recalled an expression of Palmerston's. I came across it when I was studying international relations in the faculty of law at Moscow University. Palmerston said that Britain does not have eternal friends or eternal enemies, it only has eternal interests. I told Margaret Thatcher that I agree with that. But if Palmerston and you, Britain's present political leader, admit that you have such interests, you must admit that other peoples and other countries have their interests too.

When there are about 200 states operating in the international arena, each of them strives to realize its own interests. But to what extent are they realized? This depends on the consideration given to other states' interest [as published] on the basis of cooperation. But regarding the entire world as somebody's domain is an approach which we reject. We have always said this — we said it 10 years ago, we say it today, and we will say it tomorrow: We do not have a double policy. We pursue an honest and open policy. This is how we operate and how we will continue to operate in the future.

The tension, regional conflicts, and even wars between different states in various corners of the world are rooted both in the past and in the present-day socioeconomic conditions of these countries and regions. To portray matters as if all these knots of contradictions are the result of rivalry between East and West is not only incorrect but extremely dangerous. I told the President and the U.S. delegation this.

If, for example, Mexico, Brazil, and a number of other states are today unable to pay not only their debts but also the interest on them you can picture what processes are going on in these countries. This could exacerbate the situation and lead to an explosion. Will there then again be talk about "the hand of Moscow"? Such arguments on such questions cannot be presented to the world so irresponsibly! These banalities are still current in some places; but they are impermissible, particularly at meetings such as ours. We therefore said immediately: Let us not speak banalities to each other. Many of them were voiced beforehand, in the course of the preparation for the meeting. There was quite a skirmish, and not without assistance from you journalists. (animation in the auditorium).

Of course, the Soviet Union and the United States are two mighty powers with global interests and their own allies and friends. They have their own foreign policy priorities. But the Soviet leadership sees this not as a source of confrontation but rather as a source of increased, special responsibility for the Soviet Union and the United States and their leaders for the fate of peace. This is our concept of the matter. Of course we may argue about the situation in a given region of the world. Our assessments will be different and often opposite, particularly when it is a matter of given events or the causes of given conflicts. In principle we are not opposed to discussing given regional problems in the context

of seeking ways to promote their settlement. We spoke about this and agreed with the President to continue joint efforts, which is reflected in the final joint document. But here we constantly stress — and I particularly want to say this now — without interference in other states' internal affairs. This is our conception of Soviet-U.S. relations which we brought to Geneva and which we spelled out to the President and the entire U.S. delegation. It was presented in more detailed form, but I have attempted to expound its essence to you here.

We consider that the improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations is entirely possible. Many problems — I would say whole piles — which need to be cleared away have built up. The Soviet leadership has the political will to see that this work is done. But it must be done jointly with the U.S. side. It is well known that when geologists or miners experience an rockfall and find themselves in a critical situation rescue teams advance toward each other to save people.

To save our relations from the growth of tension, ensure that they do not move in the direction of confrontation, and return them to a normal channel, to normalization [ozdorovleniye] — this work must be done by joint efforts. We are ready for this. I told the U.S. President that it would be a great mistake if we failed to make use of the chance that has emerged for turning the situation in Soviet-U.S. relations in the direction of normalization [normalizatsiya] and consequently in the direction of improving the situation in the world as a whole.

I wish to return once again to the main question which was, as it were, the pivot of the meeting in Geneva. There was not a single session, not a single one-on-one meeting, at which questions of war and peace and arms control did not occupy the central place. This was the pivot of the Geneva meeting. We explained to the U.S. side that the "star wars" program will not only impart impetus to the arms race in all kinds of arms but will also put an end to any containment [sderzhivaniye] of this race. In response we were repeatedly told about the allegedly defensive nature of the large-scale ABM system with space-based elements. We were asked: What would you tell your people after Geneva if you gave up the introduction of strategic arms reductions? Our reply to this was as follows — and I will repeat it: This is not the case. We are prepared for a radical reduction in nuclear weapons provided that the door to the development of an arms race in space is firmly shut. Given this condition we are prepared to travel the first stage on the basis of the application of the 50-percent principle of nuclear arms reductions and then, involving the other nuclear powers, to advance further along the path of radical reductions.

In a certain part of the world, maybe even among some political figures, and in journalistic circles there is a kind of certain positive reaction to SDI, so to speak. It is allegedly a defensive weapon, some kind of shield. This is absolutely not so. Essentially — taking into account the fact that mountains of weapons have already accumulated in the world, an arms race is in progress, and we cannot cope with this process in any way, take it in hand, and curb and reverse it — what the United States is proposing to us in this most complex situation is the initiation of a competition in space. Who can guarantee that in that case we would be at all able to organize productive talks of some kind? I believe that no sober-minded person could give such a guarantee. The U.S. side does not wish to acknowledge that SDI means putting weapons into space. These are indeed weapons. They — U.S. and Soviet weapons — would be flying in waves above people's heads. We would all gaze at the sky and anticipate what would rain down from it. Let us imagine — and we said this to the U.S. side — the consequence of even an accidental collison in space. let us say that something breaks off a missile — the tip [golovnaya chast], shall we say, carries on while the delivery vehicle [nesushchaya chast] falls away and collides with a cluster of these space weapons. Signals would go out, which would be interpreted almost as an attempt by the other side — in this instance I am not talking about our side or any particular side — as a signal that an attempt is being made to destroy these weapons. All the computers are switched on, and in this situation politicians can do nothing sensible at all. What, are we going to be the prisoner of these events? Many pictures of this kind could be painted. I told the U.S. President: We feel that this idea has captivated him as a man, and to some extent we can understand this. But his position as a politician responsible for such a powerful state and for security questions is incomprehensible to us in this matter. We believe that following our talks the U.S. side will weigh most responsibly everything that we said on this subject.

We can see that it again became clear at the meeting that the United States does not like our logic and that we can in no way discern logic in their arguments. They say: Believe us that if the United States realizes SDI first, they will share it with the Soviet Union. I then said: Mr President, I urge you, believe us — we have already said on this score that we will not be the first to use nuclear weapons and will not attack the United States. So why do you, while retaining an entire offensive potential on earth and under water, still intend to unleash an arms race in space? Do you not believe us? It transpires that you do not believe us. So why should we believe you more that you believe us? Especially since we have grounds for not believing you since we are extending an invitation not to go into space and to engage in disarmament on earth. All this is comprehensible to everybody.

In general I would like to hope that this is not the U.S. side's final word. The conversation with the President was detailed; we listened attentively to each other's arguments and took note of it all. If the United States finds the will and determination to again ponder and assess all the deleterious aspects and consequences of the "star wars" program the way will be opened for the constructive solution of problems of international security and the ending of the arms race. When I say this, I bear in mind that this also applies to monitoring problems. Numerous speculations are being built around this problem, with the USSR's position being deliberately distorted. But the truth is that the Soviet Union is open to monitoring. If agreement is reached on banning the putting of weapons into space, we are prepared on a reciprocal basis to open our laboratories for monitoring of such an accord. But the kind of thing that is being proposed to us is: Let us open up the laboratories and monitor the progress of the arms race in space. This is naivete, and moreover the point of departure is flawed and unacceptable.

If the U.S. side also ends any nuclear weapon tests and we conclude an agreement on this, again there will be no problems

from our side with respect to monitoring, including international monitoring.

If the two sides agree to reduce nuclear weapons by 50 percent, it is of course necessary to monitor the reduction process; and we have no less interest in this than does the United States.

I wish to say in literally a couple of words that, at this stage, differences of position emerged with respect to a 50-percent reduction of nuclear weapons. We have criticisms of the draft submitted by the United States, and the United States has criticisms of our drafts. but we do not dramatize these differences and are prepared to seek a mutually acceptable solution — if, of course, an arms race is not started in space. The two sides' proposals are a basis for seeking mutually acceptable solutions. Compromises are possible here; time and clarification of the situation will be required. We are prepared to seek these solutions proceeding from the fundamental principle that we do not seek to achieve military superiority and are in favor of equal security.

An exchange on problems of a humanitarian nature took place at the meeting. This resulted in corresponding agreements reflected in the joint statement. I would remind you that there was success in reaching agreement on certain questions of bilateral Soviet-U.S. relations and that agreement was reached on expanding contacts in the scientific and cultural fields and in the sphere of education and information. There will be more extensive exchanges of students, television programs, and sports delegations. Agreement in principle was reached on concluding an air traffic agreement. I believe that there is information from Moscow to the effect that this problem was also eliminated yesterday.

I want particularly to draw your attention to the fact that it was decided to jointly approach a number of other states concerning cooperation in the sphere of thermonuclear fusion. This is a very interesting idea. Its implementation could mark the start of a new chapter in an exceedingly important area: providing mankind with an essentially inexhaustible source of energy. This is a field for joint activity; and, incidentally, it needs enormous effort on the part of scientists, an enormous technological effort, and new technical decisions — all this will advance technical progress and technology.

From the viewpoint of the political results and consequences of the meeting, it is important, it seems to me, to consider yet another factor. We have seen the major political impact of the meeting. It has revealed and stimulated world public interest in the problems of Soviet-U.S. relations, the danger of the arms race, and the need to normalize the situation.

I must mention a few episodes in this connection. The day before yesterday our mission was visited by a group of leaders of U.S. pacifist movements, headed by the prominent politician Jesse Jackson. I want to say that we have seen and do see them as worthy and estimable U.S. citizens representing millions of inhabitants of the United States who signed an appeal to President Reagan and myself hoping that the meeting would be successful and containing specific proposals on strengthening peace, including a call for an end to nuclear tests. U.S. war veterens, participants in the meeting on the Elbe, have come to Geneva; representatives of many public organizations in other countries, including children's organizations, have also been here. At my request, the group was received by the Soviet delegation. It was a moving meeting. In addition to that is the fact that we have constantly been aware of the powerful support and solidarity of our socialist friends and the nonaligned countries. Prior to the meeting the leaders of six states — India, Mexico, Argentina, Tanzania, Greece, and Sweden — proposed a freeze on all types of nuclear weapons. We value highly their initiative. A large group of Nobel Prize winners put forward proposals which I was prepared to endorse immediately, except for one. There was one request or demand: Do not leave Geneva until you have reached agreement. It was risky to agree to that. It might have been a long time before I returned home (animation in the auditorium). I would react differently now. I would certainly endorse this point. (laughter in the auditorium, applause).

Esteemed gentlemen, ladies, and comrades, at decisive and critical stages in history moments of truth are absolutely vital. The international situation has become too dangerous because of the intensification of the arms race, and there have been too many fables on this score to intimidate people. There has arisen a real need to clear the air and verify words by action. The best way to do this is to have a direct discussion, the kind of discussion you would normally expect at a summit meeting, particularly when you consider our states and their role and responsibility in the world. In this case the discussion of problems is transferred to a new plane, where it is no longer possible to hide from the truth. So when we talk about the general results of the meeting, there is scarcely going to be one correct and straightforward assessment. Of course, it would have been far better if in Geneva we had reached agreement on the main, key problem — ending the arms race. This did not happen, unfortunately.

The U.S. side was not yet ready for major decisions. But I think that the process as a whole could not have been solved in those 2 days even if it had been on that wavelength. We have the mechanism. But, at the same time, the meeting was too important an event to be evaluated in oversimplified terms. It provided a clearer picture of the nature of our differences and made it possible to dismiss — at least that is what I believe and hope — certain biased opinions about the USSR and the policy of its leadership and remove some of the prejudices that have built up. This may have a beneficial effect on the future process of the development of events. Trust is not restored right away; it is a difficult process. We have heeded the U.S. President's assurances that the United States is not seeking superiority and does not want nuclear war. We sincerely want these statements to be confirmed by action.

I would like to see the meeting as the start of a dialogue aimed at achieving changes for the better in Soviet-U.S. relations and in the world in general. And in this sense I would assess the meeting as having created opportunities for progress.

This is our general assessment of the results and significance of the meeting. And it gives me grounds, as I leave hospitable Geneva, for viewing the future with optimism. Common sense must triumph. Until we meet again. (applause).

M.S. Gorbachev then answered journalists' questions.

Question (BBC, Britain): Mr General Secretary, what, in your view, are the prospects for the development of mutual relations between the USSR and the United States and the international situation as a whole after the Geneva meeting?

Answer: I am still optimistic about the future. If we all continue to act in the spirit of responsibility, both in Soviet-U.S. relations and in international relations as a whole, which was felt at the Geneva meeting, we will find answers to the most urgent problems and approaches to their solution. I am deeply conviced of this.

Question (Soviet television): You talked of the need for a new approach in present-day international relations, new thinking even. What do you see as the substance of this new approach, this new thinking?

Answer: Yes, I beleive that a new policy is needed at the present stage of international relations, which is characterized by a greater interrelationship between states, by their interdependence.

We think that the new approach requires that the present-day policy of any state should be a product of the realities of today's world. This is the chief prerequisite for a constructive foreign policy. And this will lead to an improvement of the situation in the world.

Problems of peace and war lie at the center of world politics. They are a special preoccupation of all peoples.

In all countries, in the developed capitalist and socialist and in the developing countries, there are economic problems, there are social problems, there are ecological problems. They can best be solved on the basis of cooperation and mutual understanding. Dialogue is needed, cooperation must be expanded; it requires a combined effort.

Take the problems of the developing world: you cannot escape from them. And the new policy, which accords with the realities, compels us all to seek answers to the problems of this multitude of states which are striving for a better life.

The paramount question — and I return to it — is that everything must be done to halt the arms race. Realization of this is growing. Unless this task is solved, all our hopes, plans, and actions could be undermined.

I am convinced that there will be no progress with the old approach which hinges on purely egotistical interests — although it is presented as protection of national interests. A new policy is needed, one that accords with the present stage, taking into account the realities brought to the fore by the actual course of world development.

Question (U.S. NBC television): During World War II the United States and the Soviet Union fought together against fascism and defeated it. In view of your conversations with President Reagan, do you consider that the Soviet Union and the United States can be allies again in the struggle against famine in Africa, against international terrorism, against environmental pollution, against such diseases as cancer and others?

Answer: I am grateful to you for recalling an important stage in our joint history. We remember it; we have not forgotten it. I think that as a result of the Geneva meeting there are possibilities for broad cooperation between our countries and peoples. And when I say between our countries and peoples, I am not oversimplying the situation.

I know the depth of the differences that currently separate us, and I am aware of the real state of current Soviet-U.S. relations. But I am convinced that collaboration is possible, including cooperation on the problems you mention. I am not going to dwell on the nuances of these problems at the moment. We will be able to make enormous funds available to come to the aid of the developing countries.

Today a vast number of people, half of them children, are hungry or undernourished in Latin America alone. A 5- to 10-percent reduction in world military expenditure would make it possible to eliminate this problem.

So we ought to think about this problem.

I welcome your question and I answer in the affirmative, although this does not mean that there are not certain differences of approach to the problems you mention.

Question (U.S. NBC television): You said you were disappointed with President Reagan's answer on SDI. After the meeting there are still as many weapons as there were before the meeting. Can one say that the world is a safer place after Geneva? If so, why?

Answer: I will take the liberty of saying that although there are as many weapons as before the meeting, the world has become a safer place. At any rate, it appears to me that the meeting itself and its results are a definite contribution to the strengthening of security, since the meeting represents the start of the path to dialogue, to understanding — that is, to what helps to strengthen security. Geneva has had a political impact in this area.

Question (*PRAVDA*): What specific, practical steps could the Soviet Union and the United States take to ensure an immediate end to the arms race?

Answer: Although I have devoted an entire speech to this, I want to say once again: We must stop.

If we prevent the arms race in space, both our proposals and what the U.S. side is proposing make it possible to move forward, to seek compromises and strive for parity at a lower level. There is a good mechanism for this — the Geneva talks.

I would add that we hope that the U.S. Administration has not yet said its final word on the banning of all nuclear weapon tests. The whole world wants this. The U.S. side still has time to ponder the situation. A positive decision would be an enormous step which would stimulate the process of halting and reducing the arms race.

I think that this process would be facilitated by the further deepening of dialogue between the USSR and the United States. We have agreed to expand it and I think that participation in political dialogue by our countries' top leaders will contribute to the process of discontinuation of the arms race.

And another thing: What is being discussed at the Geneva talks — that is, the objectives and subject of the talks — is a matter for all the peoples. Responsible politicians, above all state leaders, must adopt a firm and constructive stance on this question. This would be of enormous significance.

I think that the vast majority of politicians want to speed up the quest for solutions in Geneva and to find ways to halt the arms race and effect disarmament.

Question (GDR television): What, in your opinion, are the most important results of the meeting? And another question: What is the significance of political dialogue at the highest level?

Answer: In answer to your question, I would like to stress first of all that the Geneva meeting is an important stage in Soviet-U.S. relations. It lays the foundations for the quest for ways of improving them and normalizing them in all salients. If this quest is continued in further joint efforts by the two sides, this will help to improve the world situation. That, I would say, is the political result.

At the Geneva meeting attention was centered on questions of concern to the peoples of the world. The joint statement of the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States to the effect that nuclear war is impossible, that it must never be unleashed, that they do not seek military superiority, that they will give new impetus to the Geneva talks — this in itself is of tremendous significance, if it is consistently implemented in practical steps.

Now your second question. I think the meeting showed that under all conditions we should seek to maintain political dialogue, which makes it possible to compare our positions, understand each other better, and on this basis seek mutually acceptable solutions to the vital problems of today.

Question (the Italian newspaper *IL MATTINO*): During World War II the Soviet Union suffered great material and human losses. All the same, do you not think that 40 years after the end of the war the Soviet Union could promote the unification of the two German states?

Answer: I think that question was discussed and examined in great depth at the Helsinki conference. The Helsinki process and the Final Act signed by all the states of Europe, as well as the United States and Canada, is our common achievement.

The Helsinki process deserves our support, deserves to be developed in every way. So the results of Helsinki answer your question.

Question (Swiss radio): You stressed the profound difference in the positions of the USSR and the United States on "star wars." Does not this hamper progress at the Geneva talks?

Answer: I do not want to repeat what has been said. Our position can be expressed in a few words. We adhere to a constructive line at the Geneva talks. We will seek a solution in order to stop the arms race and achieve a radical reduction in nuclear arms, so that at some subsequent stage we can really approach the elimination of nuclear weapons with the participation of all nuclear powers. It is our firm belief that this is possible, if the door is firmly closed on the development of an arms race in space.

Question (AP): You spoke of the President's personal commitment to the "star wars" program and said that you discussed the SDI in detail. How did he treat your arguments? How did he react to them? Do you see a possibility of breaking the deadlock on this issue?

Answer: I think that after the meeting the U.S. side has grounds to consider everything that we said. We hope that our arguments will be understood. They embody a meaning which, as we see it, is in line with the spirit of the January accord; namely, that as a result of the Geneva talks, we must take the path of radical reductions in nuclear arms provided that an arms race in space is prevented.

This objective was jointly determined by us earlier. The U.S. President declares that SDI is a shield. I hope that we demonstrated convincingly that it is a space weapon which could be used against missiles, against satellites, and against targets on earth. This is a new type of weapon. A new sphere of the arms race is thereby opened up. This is unacceptable. This would complicate the entire situation and would create a problematic atmosphere at the Geneva talks.

This is why I value the fact that it has been emphasized at the level of the U.S. President and the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee that work at the Geneva talks will be accelerated on the basis of the January accord.

This is now a viewpoint which is backed not only by the signatures of foreign ministers but also by the leaders of the two states. We regard this as a certain signal and hope.

Question (BBC, Britain): If it proves impossible to agree on ending the arms race in space, will the Soviet Union be able to compete with U.S. technology in this sphere, or will it fall behind the United States?

Answer: You have touched on a very interesting question. During a frank and direct conversation, I tried to explain to the President that it seems to me that a great deal in U.S. policy regarding the Soviet Union is based on delusions. On the one hand, they hope that the arms race and its continuation will exhaust the Soviet Union economically, will weaken its influence in the world, and will thereby free the hands of the United States of America. History disgraced these prophets. And this was at a time when our society possessed a potential different from today's and lesser opportunities. Now we possess a tremendous potential. And delusions about us only hamper the pursuit of a realistic policy.

On the other hand there were also delusions with regard to military calculations. They tried to overtake us. They adopted intercontinental ballistic missiles as part of their armory. This was followed by the response. The response came a little late, but it came. Then multiple [razdelyayushchiye] nuclear warheads appeared. Followed by the response. We have always found a response. I think that the illusions existing in U.S. military circles have now been passed on in some degree to political circles, and in particular to the President, perhaps. I do not claim this, but that was the impression we formed.

The United States clearly believes that it has something of a lead over us in certain types of technology, in computer and radioelectronic technology. Once again a desire is emerging to seize this "advantage" and to secure military superiority for themselves. The well-known phrase of President Johnson's, who once said that the nation that dominates in space will also dominate on earth, is again in vogue. Some people are clearly itching to achieve world domination and to look down haughtily on the world. These are the old ambitions of former years. The world has changed a great deal in many respects.

So when it comes to the so-called technological superiority that it is planned to embody in the SDI, thus placing the Soviet Union in a difficult position, what I want to say is: This is another delusion. A response will be found.

I said as much to the President: "You must bear in mind that you are not dealing with simpletons."

If the President is so committed to the SDI, we naturally regard it as our duty to thoroughly investigate the "star wars" program. And we have examined the problem. Especially as the U.S. side is putting forward a kind of invitation: Let's see, let's take a look, let's discuss not the question of preventing the militarization of space but what weapons to take into space. we are against this. we are against an arms race in space.

We also analyzed the other aspect of the question: Suppose the United States does not accept our arguments, does not appreciate our good will and our call to seek a way out along the road of ending the arms race and reducing the existing nuclear weapons; in other words, suppose they travel the former path. We will of course find a response. The Soviet leadership once gave appropriate instructions to the competent organizations and scientists, and we can say that our response will be effective, less expensive, and able to be implemented in a shorter time. But this is not our political choice. That choice is to induce the United States nonetheless to consider the whole situation and pursue a responsible policy on a basis of common sense, on a basis of consideration of people's sentiments and aspirations, and not to complicate this, the most acute problem in international relations.

Question (Czechoslovak television and the newspaper *RUDE PRAVO*): In what specific and practical spheres do you see possibilities of developing Soviet-U.S. relations after your meeting with President Reagan?

Answer: I think political dialogue will expand. And it will be conducted at various levels. We have agreed to exchange visits. In itself this must be welcomed. We will have additional opportunities to develop bilateral cooperation in the spheres on which we reached agreement. Clearly, we will continue to expand our consultations to examine regional problems and the situation in various regions.

Finally, we proceed from the premise that both we and U.S. business circles retain a mutual interest — I know this for certain — in improving relations. If things go in this direction, it will make it possible to expand the scale of cooperation in the economic sphere. We are prepared to invite U.S. business circles to participate in implementing major projects. We have great plans. With the West Europeans we are now doing much to expand the framework of our economic cooperation. We welcome this.

I expressed to the President the thought that the sphere of economic relations cannot be underestimated. Not because the United States cannot live without us or we cannot live without them. Wwe will be perfectly able to live without the United States. And I hope United States will live without us. But this is the material base for political relations, for their improvement, and for the formation of an atmosphere of trust.

Frankly speaking, interdependence emerges in the process of economic ties. And this interdependence is then reflected during the resolution of political problems. I think that a further expansion of economic ties would accord with the interests of both the Soviet Union and the United States of America. But don't think that we're fishing for this.

Question (the Lebanese newspaper *AL-NAHAR ARAB REPORT*): Speaking of regional questions, did you discuss the situation in the Near East, and the situation in Lebanon in particular? What is your forecast regarding the situation there after the summit meeting?

Answer: During the meeting we touched on the situation in regions such as Central America, the Near East, and Africa. However, practically the whole time was devoted to examining the fundamental [printsipialnyy] aspect of these questions. We agreed to continue political consultations and to expand the framework of collaboration on regional problems.

Question (the writer Yu. Semenov): Mikhail Sergeyevich, you have said that it is necessary to learn the art of living together. My experience as a writer shows that, beginning with the dismal McCarthy era, U.S. movies and television have unfortunately portrayed Soviet man as some kind of monster to the U.S. people. Don't you think that now, after the Geneva meeting, it would be very important for the United States to revise such prejudiced notions and view the Soviet people more objectively as a partner of the U.S. people?

Answer: Here's what I have to say to you, Comrade Semenov. Don't leave everything to political leaders. (animation in the hall.) We have agreed on an expansion of cultural contacts — including the movies — so you get together and reach agreement with each other. It is necessary to act in the spirit of Geneva; that is, to promote an improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations.

PRAVDA Publishes Joint Summit Statement

LD211115 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 85
Second Edition pp 1, 3

[Unattributed report: "Joint Soviet-U.S. Statement"]

[Text] By mutual agreement, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and President of the United States Ronald Reagan met in Geneva 19-21 November 1985.

Attending the meeting on the Soviet side were member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Foreign Minister of the USSR Eduard Shevardnadze; First Deputy Foreign Minister of the USSR Georgiy Korniyenko; the USSR's Ambassador to the United States Anatoliy Dobrynin; head of the Propaganda Department of the CPSU Central Committee Aleksandr Yakovlev; head of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee Leonid Zamyatin; assistant to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Andrey Aleksandrov. On the U.S. side — U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, Chief of Staff Donald Regan, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs Robert McFarlane, U.S. Ambassador to the USSR Arthur Hartman, Special Adviser to the President and the Secretary of State for Arms Control Paul H. Nitze, Assistant Secretary of State Rozanne Ridgway, Special Assistant to the President Jack Matlock.

Basic [osnovnyy] questions of Soviet-U.S. relations and the present-day international situation as a whole were comprehensively discussed during the exchange of opinions that took place. The discussions were frank and useful. Serious differences remain on a number of key issues.

While acknowledging the differences in the sociopolitical systems of the USSR and the United States and their approaches to international problems, the two leaders gained at the same time a better understanding of each other's positions. They agreed about the need to improve Soviet-U.S. relations and the international situation as a whole. In this connection the two sides confirmed the importance of an ongoing dialogue, reflecting their serious desire to seek common ground on existing problems.

The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the President of the United States agreed to meet again in the near future. In this connection the U.S. President accepted an invitation by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee to visit the Soviet Union. For his part, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee accepted an invitation by the President of the United States to visit the United States of America. Arrangements for and timing of the visits will be agreed upon through diplomatic channels.

During the meeting, accords were reached on some specific questions, which are set out below.

I.

The sides, having discussed key security issues, and conscious of the special responsibility of the USSR and the United States for maintaining peace, are stating that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. Recognizing that any conflict between the USSR and the United States could have catastrophic consequences, they also emphasized the importance of preventing any war between them, whether nuclear or conventional. They will not seek to achieve military superiority.

The general secretary and the President discussed the negotiations on nuclear and space arms.

They agreed to accelerate the work at these negotiations, with a view to accomplishing the tasks set down in the joint Soviet-U.S. statement of 8 January 1985, namely: to prevent an arms race in space and to terminate it on earth, to limit and reduce nuclear arms and enhance strategic stability.

Noting the proposals recently tabled by the Soviet Union and the United States, they called for early progress, particularly in areas where there is common ground, including the principle of 50-percent reductions in the nuclear arms of the sides appropriately applied, as well as the idea of an interim agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe. During the elaboration of these agreements, effective measures for verification of compliance with obligations assumed will be agreed upon.

The sides agreed to study the question at the expert level of centers to reduce nuclear risk taking into account the development of talks in Geneva and the questions discussed at them. They noted with satisfaction such recent steps in this direction as the modernization of the Soviet-U.S. hotline.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan reaffirmed the commitment of the USSR and the United States to the treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and their interest in strengthening together with other countries the nonproliferation regime, and in further enhancing the effectiveness of the treaty, inter alia by enlarging its membership.

They note with satisfaction the overall positive results of the recent review conference of the treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

The USSR and the United States reaffirm their commitment, assumed by them under the treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, to pursue negotiations in good faith on matters of nuclear arms limitation and disarmament in accordance with Article V of the treaty.

The two sides plan to continue to promote the strengthening of the International Atomic Energy Agency and to support the activities of the agency in implementing safeguards as well as in promoting the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. They view positively the practice of regular Soviet-U.S. consultations on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons which have been business-like and constructive and express the intent to continue this practice in the future.

In the context of discussing security problems, the two sides reaffirmed that they are in favor of a general and complete prohibition of chemical weapons and the destruction of existing stockpiles of such weapons. They agreed to step up efforts to

conclude an effective and verifiable international convention on this matter.

The two sides agreed to intensify bilateral discussions the expert level on all aspects of such a chemical weapons ban, including the question of verification. They agreed to embark on a discussion of the question of preventing the proliferation of chemical weapons.

The two sides emphasized the importance they attach to the Vienna negotiations on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe and expressed their willingness to work for positive results there.

Attaching great importance to the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe and noting the progress made there, the two sides stated their intention to facilitate, together with the other participating states, an early and successful completion of the work of the conference. To this end, they reaffirmed the need for a document which would both include mutually acceptable confidence- and security-building measures and give concrete expression and effect to the principle of non-use of force.

II.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan agreed on the need to place on a regular basis and intensify dialogue at various levels. Along with meetings between the leaders of the two countries, this envisages regular meetings between the USSR minister of foreign affairs and the U.S. secretary of state, as well as between the heads of other ministries and agencies. They agree that the recent mutual visits by the heads of ministries and departments in such fields as agriculture, housing, and protection of the environment have been useful.

Recognizing the usefulness of the already held exchanges of views on regional problems, including those at the expert level, they agreed to continue such exchanges on a regular basis.

The sides intend to expand the programs of bilateral, cultural, educational, scientific-technical exchanges, and also to develop trade and economic ties. The general secretary and the President attended the signing of the agreement on contacts and exchanges in scientific, educational and cultural fields.

They believe that there should be greater understanding between our peoples and that to this end they will encourage greater travel and people-to-people contact.

The sides agree on the importance of resolving matters concerning individual citizens in the spirit of cooperation.

The two leaders noted with satisfaction that, in cooperation with the Government of Japan, the Soviet Union and the United States have agreed to a set of measures to increase safety on air routes in the north Pacific and have at this time worked out steps to implement them.

They acknowledged that delegations from the USSR and the United States have begun negotiations aimed at resumption of air services. The two leaders expressed their desire to reach a mutually beneficial agreement on that score at an early date. In this regard, an agreement was reached on the simultaneous opening of consulates-general in New York and Kiev respectively.

Both sides agreed to contribute to the preservation of the environment — a global task — through joint research and practical measures. In accordance with the existing Soviet-U.S. agreement in this area, consultations will be held next year in Moscow and Washington on specific programs of cooperation.

The two leaders agreed on the advisability [tselesoobraznost] of broadening exchanges and contacts including some of their new forms in a number of spheres of science, education, medicine, and sports — namely cooperation in the development of educational exchanges and software for elementary and secondary school instruction; measures to promote Russian language studies in the United States and English language studies in the USSR; the annual exchange of professors to conduct special courses in history, culture and economics at the relevant departments of Soviet and U.S. institutions of higher education; mutual allocation of scholarships for the best students in the natural sciences, technology, social sciences, and humanities for the period of an academic year; holding regular meets in various sports and increased television coverage of sports events, and so on. The two sides agreed to resume cooperation in combating cancer diseases.

The relevant agencies in each of the countries are being instructed to develop specific programs for these exchanges. The resulting programs will be examined by the leaders of the two countries at their next meeting.

The two leaders emphasized the potential importance of the work aimed at utilizing controlled thermonuclear fusion for peaceful purposes and, in this connection, advocated the widest practicable development of international cooperation in obtaining this source of energy, which is essentially inexhaustible, for the benefit of all mankind.

Correspondents Describe Geneva Final Ceremony

PM221148 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 85 Second Edition p 5

[*PRAVDA* special correspondents V. Bolshakov and B. Dubrovin dispatch: "A Big Day in Geneva"]

[Text] Geneva, 21 Nov — Today is a big day in Geneva. The concluding ceremony of the meeting between the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the President of the United States of America which, it was announced in advance, was due to be addressed by M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan, was scheduled for 1000 at the international press center.

And so, the clock shows 1000. M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan appear from two sides on the press center's podium which is decorated with Soviet and U.S. flags. The audience rose, applause thundered. Hundreds of television, movie, and still cameras focused on the two leaders, on whose conversations mankind's attention has been focused during these days.

The USSR and U.S. leaders were welcomed by President K. Furgler. M.S. Gorbachev spoke first. Assessing the great work done in Geneva, he said that the detailed, in-depth, direct, and frank discussion of a number of major problems of relations between the two countries and the present-day situation in the world was in itself useful. And even though one had not succeeded at this meeting in finding solutions to the most important questions concerning the task of terminating the arms race, and major differences remain on fundamental questions, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the President of the United States of America had agreed that work on the quest of mutually acceptable solutions to these most important questions will continue.

For his part, President R. Reagan spoke of the fact that the 2 days of talks held in Geneva must give a certain impetus to the work on existing problems.

There followed one more joint Soviet-U.S. action — the last within the meeting's framework: USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz signed a Soviet-U.S. agreement to the accompaniment of applause from the audience.

M.S. Gorbachev, R. Reagan, and K. Furgler left the hall. They were followed by an avalanche of journalists. or to be more precise, by those journalists possessing the light-green identity badges bearing a letter "A" for admission to M.S. Gorbachev's press conference at the Soviet mission. Less than 30 minutes were left before it was due to begin. Buses awaited the journalists outside the press center. But many rushed past them, relying more on their own two feet. After all, it is only a 10-minutes walk to our mission here....

The press conference began at precisely 1100.

M.S. Gorbachev described in detail the course of the talks. He was still immersed in them and seemed to be continuing his conversation with President R. Reagan. He hardly glanced at the papers lying in front of him. It was obvious that everything he was saying consisted of profoundly considered beliefs. Listening to him, it seemed as if one was being drawn along by the thread of his thoughts.

The Soviet leader's press conference was immediately evaluated as an exceptionally important event by our colleagues here. "Staggering!" — was the exclamation by NBC-TV commentator Marvin Kalb, who asked a question about the potential revival of Soviet-U.S. cooperation, which was so successful during the war against fascism. "Splendid!" — *CHICAGO SUN-TIMES* correspondent S. Winter seconded him. Saudi Arabian journalist Burhan Hayil said: "To be honest, before Gorbachev's speech I did not even imagine that matters were so serious, so dangerous for all mankind. His words have made this clear to me now. And now I sincerely express the hope that the two powers — the USSR and the United States — will continue their discussions so as to reduce arms. Maybe as a result we will have a truly wonderful world."

RUDE PRAVO observer Dusan Rovensky told your correspondents: "The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee gave vivid answers to the most important questions of our time. The world must know the real state of affairs. And it has learned the truth. In actual fact, this is the 'moment of truth' which all of us expected in Geneva."

Now, while we are transmitting these lines from the press center, we can hear it said in all languages of the world: "Urgent! Flash! We are transmitting a report on the press conference by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee."

Reagan Speech Carried Live on Moscow Television

LD220042 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0915 GMT 21 Nov 85

[Remarks by President Ronald Reagan at Geneva international press center ceremony held jointly with General Secretary Gorbachev, in English with superimposed Russian translation; following taken from Russian translation — live]

[Text] President, General Secretary Gorbachev. I would like to express my deep personal appreciation to the people of Switzerland for the creation of conditions for our fruitful talks. You have long traditions of assistence to international peace and you can be proud that you are the capital of international talks. So, we express our deep gratitude to the Government of Switzerland and the people.

I have come to Geneva to look for a new start in the the relations between the United States and the USSR. General Secretary Gorbachev and I have had comprehensive discussion embracing all questions of our relations. I am convinced that we are going the right way. We have achieved some intermediate results which are described in our joint statement. We have given instructions to our representatives who are conducting talks to work toward the strengthening of peace. I believe that we have started a process which will lead to a deeper understanding between our countries. These 2 days of talks have given an impulse to our work on our relations and we can continue this at a meeting next year on which he has agreed. Before my arrival in Geneva I had talked many times about the need to build trust between us by way of direct and personal talks. I am convinced that General Secretary Gorbachev will agree that such a trust has to be built on deeds and not on words.

I have already spoken about proposals which the United States made in the past — their motivation is namely such. [as heard] Results will be seen only after months or even years, but we know the answers which have to be given to these questions. We have to reduce our strategic arms, offensive, [as heard] and to create a more reliable peace. We have to achieve a peaceful solution of conflicts in Asia and Central America, so the people there can decide and determine their fate without outside interference. The people of the United States and the Soviet Union, peoples of the whole world are ready to say yes to these efforts.

I am leaving Geneva and our summit with a determination to work toward the strengthening of peace. It will be a difficult task,but we are ready for it. General Secretary Gorbachev, I

invite you to join us in these efforts and to complete this work. Thank you. [applause]

Gorbachev Briefs Warsaw Pact Leaders on Summit

Met by Husak in Prague

LD211400 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1350 GMT 21 Nov

[Text] Prague, 21 Nov (TASS) — Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, arrived in Prague today to participate in the meeting of Warsaw Pact member states' general and first secretaries of the fraternal parties' central committees.

At the airport, Mikhail Gorbachev was met by Gustav Husak, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, and other leading figures of the Czechoslovak party.

Welcoming Party Includes Grishin

LD211522 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1441 GMT 21 Nov

[Text] Prague, 21 Nov (TASS) — M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee arrived today in Prague to take part in the meeting of general and first secretaries of the Central Committees of the fraternal parties of the Warsaw Pact member states. The following officials arrived with him: E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR minister of foreign affairs; A.N. Yakovlev, chief of the CPSU Central Committee propaganda department; and A.M. Aleksandrov, assistant to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Among those who met him were V.V. Grishin, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first secretary of the Moscow City Gorkom, who is here on the occasion of Moscow Day in Prague, and V.P. Lomakin, USSR ambassador to the CSSR.

Gorbachev Meets With Husak

PM221041 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 85 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Friendly Talks"]

[Text] Prague, November 21 TASS — Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who has arrived in Prague to attend a meeting of the top leaders of the Warsaw Treaty member countries, has had a conversation in Prague Castle with Gustav Husak, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and president of Czechoslovakia.

In the course of the friendly conversation the sides exchanged information on preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress and the 17th Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and reviewed questions of Soviet-Czechoslovak cooperation and the international situation.

The sides noted with satisfaction the high level of cooperation between the fraternal parties and the intensive character of Soviet-Czechoslovak contacts in every field. They voiced their mutual desire for the further development of relations of an alliance between the Soviet Union and Socialist Czechoslovakia, and for strengthening fraternity between the peoples of the two states. In this context the sides spoke highly of Days of Soviet Culture in Czechoslovakia within the framework of a traditional month of Soviet-Czechoslovak friendship.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Gustav Husak spoke highly of the constant expansion of Soviet-Czechoslovak economic ties and of the priority role of scientific and technical cooperation in tackling vital tasks of the further advance of both countries.

They noted the great importance of the consistent implementation of the program of long-term economic, scientific, and technical cooperation between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia to the year 2000 and the active participation of both countries in drafting and fulfilling the comprehensive program for the scientific and technical progress of the CEMA member countries.

They stressed that the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit made it possible to advance towards mutually acceptable agreements on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security, agreements envisioning the prevention of the spread of the arms race into space and arms reductions on earth. As for the realization of that possibility, it depends on the efforts of both sides and it is to this objective that the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia and other socialist countries direct their efforts.

In the course of their conversation, Mikhail Gorbachev and Gustav Husak reiterated the unflagging resolve to work jointly with all the countries of the socialist community for a turn for the better in European and world relations and to step up the struggle against the threat of nuclear war and for lasting peace and security for the peoples.

The meeting passed in an atmosphere of cordiality, complete unity and mutual understanding that is characteristic of relations between the CPSU and the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia.

Warsaw Pact Meeting

PM221043 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 85 Second Edition p 1

[Text] Prague, November 21 TASS — A meeting of the top leaders of the Warwaw Treaty member countries took place by their mutual agreement in Prague on 21 November 1985.

The meeting was attended by Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and chairman of the Council of State of the People's Republic of Bulgaria; Janos Kadar, general secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party; Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic; Wojciech Jaruzelski, first secretary of the Central Committee of the United Polish Workers' Party and chairman

of the Council of State of the Polish People's Republic; Nicolae Ceausescu, general secretary of the Rumanian Communist Party and president of the Socialist Republic of Rumania; Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union; Gustav Husak, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and president of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic; and, also on the Czechoslovak side, Lubomir Strougal, a member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and chairman of the Czechoslovak Government, and Vasil Bilak, a member of the Presidium and secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.

The meeting was also attended by Foreign Minister Petur Mladenov of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Peter Varkonyi of the Hungarian People's Republic, Oskar Fischer of the German Democratic Republic, Marian Orzechowski of the Polish People's Republic, Ilie Vaduva of the Socialist Republic of Rumania, Eduard Shevardnadze of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Bohuslav Chnoupek of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

Mikhail Gorbachev gave a detailed account of the proceedings and results of the Soviet-U.S. summit in Geneva, which had ended that day.

The leaders of the fraternal parties and countries voiced full support for the constructive stand presented by Mikhail Gorbachev at his talks with U.S. President Reagan, in the spirit of the joint line put forward in a statement of the Warsaw Treaty member countries on 23 October 1985.

The top leaders of the Warsaw Treaty member countries spoke highly of the exceptionally important contribution made by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee at the Geneva meeting to the advancement of the jointly developed peace positions of the countries of the socialist community. It was unanimously noted that the direct and frank discussion which had taken place at the meeting had been needed and that its results were useful.

Though the concrete problems of the limitation and reduction of armaments were not resolved in Geneva, it is important that the meeting reiterated the Soviet-U.S. accord reached in January 1985 on the need to seek ways to prevent an arms race in outer space and to terminate it on earth.

The joint statement on the inadmissibility of nuclear war and the sides' renunciation of the achievement of military superiority that was included in the final document of the Geneva meeting is fundamentally important.

The Geneva meeting also is very important because it marked the start of a dialogue with a view to achieving changes for the better in Soviet-U.S. relations and in the world in general.

On the whole, the results of Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with U.S. President Reagan are creating more favorable opportunities for improving the international situation and for a return to detente. It is important for these opportunities to be translated into practical deeds by both sides.

Mikhail Gorbachev said that the Soviet Union for its part would make every effort to achieve practical solutions to the tasks of folding up the arms race and strengthening peace.

The meeting reiterated anew the allied socialist countries' principled course of removing the threat of nuclear war, ending the arms race on earth and preventing it from spreading into outer space, ensuring a transition to real disarmament measures and strengthening world peace. The Warsaw Treaty member countries state anew that they are not seeking military superiority but will not allow military superiority over themselves.

The participants in the meeting stated the resolve of the parties and states represented at it to work in concert and to continue to do everything they can to achieve a turn for the better in European and world affairs. They are unanimous that under difficult international conditions, the unity and cohesion of the allied socialist countries, class solidarity and growing cooperation in every field are of paramount importance.

The meeting passed in an atmosphere of friendship and complete unanimity on all questions under discussion.

Pact Leaders Depart

LD220125 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 21 Nov 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; announcer-read report]

[Text] After the meeting, Comrade Zhivkov, Kadar, Honecker, Jaruzelski, and Ceausescu left Prague. At the airport they were seen off by Gustav Husak and other Czechoslovak leaders.

Gorbachev Leaves Prague

LD221100 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1047 GMT 22 Nov

[Text] Prague, 22 Nov (TASS) — Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, left Prague for home today, having taken part in a meeting of top leaders of the Warsaw Pact member-states.

At the airport he was seen off by Gustav Husak, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee and president of the CSSR and other leading figures of the Communist Party and Government of Czechoslovakia.

Moscow Arrival

LD221334 Moscow TASS in English 1325 GMT 22 Nov 85

[Text] Moscow, November 22 TASS — General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev returned to Moscow from Prague today. He took part in a meeting of the top-level leaders of the Warsaw Treaty member states.

Mikhail Gorbachev was met at the airport by member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR Nikolay Ryzhkov, other Soviet leaders.

Shultz Describes Joint Statement as 'First Step'

LD211751 Moscow TASS in English 1737 GMT 21 Nov 85

[Text] Geneva, November 21 TASS — "The President Came to Geneva with a constructive approach and with an effort to make a fresh start in our relationship with the Soviet Union", U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz said here at a press conference in the U.S. press centre upon the the conclusion of the Soviet-U.S. Summit meeting. "And I think he achieved that fresh start. All of us who have worked in support of the two leaders who met here this week, I think share the view that perhaps we have a process under way that can lead to a more stable and constructive relationship. Of course, as both men basically emphasize, that remains to be seen, and we will be looking, over the coming months and years, to see what truly happens. But at any rate, we have made a fresh start."

Answering questions from correspondents, Shultz pointed out that the summit meeting gave a political impetus to the participants in the talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva which will undoubtedly be reflected also in the debates in Washington when the next round of the talks is discussed. In his opinion, it is much more important that the meeting promoted the establishment of relations between the two leaders of the USSR and the USA based on numerous discussions between them.

"What is set out in the joint statement I think represents a first step in the sense that some concrete things were put down and moved along as well as a process started, that of interaction", the secretary of state said. "But I believe the most important thing that happened here is that these two individuals took this over completely. It was very much their meeting, and they spent a lot of time together. That was really what we came here for and was very fruitful. And I think that length of time and the intensity and the frankness and the scope of what was talked about between the two really went beyond anything I could have expected".

Warnke Praises Summit, Decries U.S. Arms Stand

LD220936 Moscow TASS in English 0910 GMT 22 Nov 85

[Text] Washington, November 22 TASS — The results of the Soviet-American summit meeting have shown that real advancement in control over armaments is possible, said here Paul Warnke, a prominent American specialist, former director of the U.S. Arms Control and and Disarmament Agency.

He denounced the Washington administration's stubborn unwillingness to discuss the questior. of termination of development of a broad-scale anti-missile defence system with space-based elements. Any attempt to unfold a strategic defence system, he said, will bring about termination of the process of control over armaments and lead to an uncontrolled arms race. The programme of developing a broad-scale anti-missile defence system he stressed, will not contribute to stronger U.S. national security.

To attain that it is necessary to reduce the arsenals of strategic offensive armaments and to consolidate the ABM Treaty. "To spend hundreds of thousands million dollars and might be a trillion dollars for programmes of exploration and development of the Strategic Defence Initiative which will create a threat to our both countries is a reckless game with security of the United States and the whole world, said Paul Warnke. Compliance with the existing agreements and conclusion of new accords is the only way of removing the nuclear danger, he said.

Arbatov Appraises Impact of Soviet Stand on SDI

LD220007 London BBC Television Network in English 2315 GMT 21 Nov 1985

[Interview with Georgiy Arbatov, director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, by correspondent Peter Snow, in the framework of the "Newsnight" program, in Geneva on 21 November — recorded]

[Text] [Question] How do you think Mikhail Gorbachev got on with Ronald Reagan in those lonely fireside chats?

[Answer] You describe it a little bit, you know, like some intimate friendship affair or a little bit like this, which is just not the case here. It is a meeting of two statesmen who met for 2 days and the problem was whether they will be able to communicate or not. And it turned out that they were able to communicate.

[Question] All right, so there was rapport. So they could communicate. What is this going to lead to? What is the achievement?

[Answer] This has to be seen. You cannot judge on the results. You know, its like, you know, with love; you make something today, you have the result in 9 months.

[Question] Was the general secretary impressed by Mr Reagan? What did he made of him?

[Answer] I haven't discussed the problem with him in such terms, but I know — and he stated this also at the press conference — that he understood him in human terms but he couldn't understand his political logic.

[Question] Now, do you think people back home in Moscow will be disappointed that Mr Gorbachev has gone back there without getting any concessions on "star wars"?

[Answer] You understand the Soviet people. Gorbachev would prefer to have some results but I think that — well, I am sure about Gorbachev — I think also that, let's say, political people who are well-informed, they are realistic enough to understand that having a president of the United States so firmly entrenched into this position — that it has become a forbidden subject even in discussion inside the cabinet — you cannot really turn around the whole attitude within 2 days. And I am sure that Gorbachev

did not put before himself such a task, to convert him here. But I think what was important here, if you remember the President, on the eve of leaving for Geneva, has told to the public that, actually, he will explain to Gorbachev how good and useful, how beautiful SDI is and then everything will be okay. Now, I think, Reagan returns to the United States with full understanding that you cannot have both SDI and arms control. You can have either SDI or arms control. So it is a moment of truth for him. He will have to show what is he actually for, for arms control or he is for arms race.

Leaders Agree on the Need to Improve Relations

LD211618 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1330 GMT 21 Nov 85

[From the "Novosti" newscast; Valentin Zorin report]

[Text] Today Comrade Gorbachev left Geneva. Kurt Furgler, president of the Swiss Confederation, came to see off the eminent Soviet guest. Along with him were Aubert, the head of the Swiss Foreign Relations Department, and other members of the country's government, the mayor of geneva, and representatives of the municipal authorities and the administration of Geneva Canton. Also here were Ippolitov, the USSR ambassador to Switzerland, and Sytenko, the permanent representative of the USSR at the department of the UN and other international organizations in Geneva. Here are the last minutes on Swiss soil.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev bids farewell warmly to the Swiss leaders and thanks them for the hospitality they have provided and for their efforts to ensure favorable conditions for the staging of the Soviet-U.S. meeting. The Swiss officials wish Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and members of the Soviet delegation a good journey. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev thanks them for their hospitality and for the assistance which they have given during the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. Zorin comments:

Behind lie two days of full talks. Of course, it has not been easy during these days, even perhaps impossible to resolve the many problems which divide the Soviet Union and the United States. The approaches of the two countries to key issues of today are too different. But, it is already a fact that the meeting between the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and the U.S. President has been held and that the leaders have had the opportunity to exchange views and to state their points of view frankly and in a business-like fashion. That is important in and of itself. Both leaders have achieved a better understanding of the positions of the other. They have agreed on the need to improve Soviet-U.S. relations and to improve the international situation as a whole.

The attention of the whole world has been fixed on Geneva during these days. The conversations which have been held here concern every person on earth. People have become aware that we are talking about problems which affect all countries and all peoples, on the solution of which depends the further existence of mankind.

While conducting the press conference today Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed: I would like to view the Geneva meeting as the beginning of a Soviet-U.S. dialogue. This meeting has created the opportunity for progress. Common sense should triumph. The Geneva meeting is over. A start has been made on a large and important matter, if the good will of the Soviet Union meets with the corresponding will in response from the United States.

Leaders, Organizations Evaluate Results of Talks

NATO Voices 'Satisfaction'

LD211910 Moscow TASS in English 1853 GMT 21 Nov 85

[Text] Brussels, November 21 TASS — The participants in the special session of the NATO Council which has taken place here today — the heads of government from 13 countries and foreign ministers from three countries participating in the North Atlantic alliance — voiced satisfaction with the results of the Soviet-American Geneva summit between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan. This was stated at press briefings given by official spokesmen of a number of delegations. A statement released on the results of two-hour debates by NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington says that President Reagan reported to the session in positive terms on major aspects of what had taken place in Geneva. The Geneva meeting, the statement points out, is not the end of the initiated process but, as we hope, the beginning of a new and more constructive phase in the improvement of East-West relations and in strengthening peace.

Korniyenko Briefs Mitterrand

LD212022 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1824 GMT 21 Nov 85

[Text] Paris, 21 Nov (TASS) — Georgiy Korniyenko, first deputy foreign minister of the USSR, who today arrived in Paris from Geneva in accordance with an agreement, has been received by the president of France, Francois Mitterrand, and, as instructed by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, briefed the president on the Soviet-U.S. summit-level negotiations that have taken place in Geneva.

Mitterrand Welcomes Results

LD211932 Moscow TASS in English 1839 GMT 21 Nov 85

[Text] Paris, November 21 TASS — "I welcome the Soviet-U.S. Geneva summit that ended in a good atmosphere," French President Francois Mitterrand said here today. "It is a good sign that a dialogue between the two great powers has been resumed", he said at a press conference. Touching upon the consequences of the international developments for France, the head of the French state confirmed that France will continue ensuring its security by means of its strategic systems of deterrence.

CSSR Envoy Stresses Importance

LD211730 Moscow TASS in English 1656 GMT 21 Nov 85

[Text] Vienna, November 21 TASS — Head of Czechoslovakia's delegation at the talks on mutual force and arms reduction in central Europe, Ambassador L. Handl, pointed to special importance of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting that was held in Geneva. Speaking at a plenary meeting, L. Handl stressed that the meeting will, undoubteldy, influence the further developments of the international situation, the process of disarmament and the Vienna talks.

The head of the delegation of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic pointed to the importance of non-increase of the level of forces and armaments of the sides in central Europe in the context of the proposals of socialist countries of February 14, 1985, on initial reductions. If the sides seriously intend to take efforts aimed at military detente and improvement of the military and political situation in central Europe, they must first of all arrest the process of the build-up of forces and armaments in the region.

Striving to promote the quest of a mutually acceptable solution of the question of arms freeze, we leave aside at the given stage the question of modernization and propose to assume the commitment only on non-increase of the level of the main types of armaments existing at a time of an agreement's coming into force, he went on. It is extremely important, however, in the period of the operation of an interim agreement to prevent any deployment in central Europe, under the pretext of modernization, of qualitatively new systems of conventional armaments whose destructive force would be close to that of weapons of mass destruction.

Nakasone Assessment

LD212014 Moscow TASS in English 1946 GMT 21 Nov 85

[Text] Tokyo, November 21 TASS — Our assessment of the results of the Geneva meeting is highly positive, Yasuhiro Nakasone, Prime Minister of Japan, has said in a conversation with a group of journalists. In my opinion, it opened up the way to the improvement of American-Soviet relations, he underlined.

It is very good that both leaders agreed to continue consultations. Peace is preserved while negotiations are going on. I believe that the pledge of the U.S. and the USSR to exert efforts with a view to preserving peace will make a favourable impact on the relations between Japan and the Soviet Union.

Sweden Hails Further Dialogue

LD212157 Moscow TASS in English 2137 GMT 21 Nov 85

[Text] Stockholm, November 21 TASS — The Swedish Government hopes that the agreements reached at Geneva now will accelerate the process leading to an end of confrontation, and contributing to detente and cooperation, says the statement of the Swedish Government. A summary of the document, expressing satisfaction with the results of the Soviet-American summit meeting at Geneva, has been issued here by the Swedish news agency.

The Swedish Government welcomes the decision of the leaders of the two countries to meet again in Moscow and Washington, the statement stresses. Thus the summit level dialogue will be continued. The results of the meeting between the two leaders strengthen the conviction of the Swedish Government that differences can be overcome through a dialogue and talks, with due regard for general security and the interests of both countries.

The government considers it important, the statement stresses, that both leaders agree that a nuclear war cannot be won. They also strongly pointed out that war between the USSR and the USA could have catastrophic consequences. Realisation of that should lead to the conclusion of the need for the speediest attainment of specific results in the field of disarmament and that the talks should bring about an ultimate scrapping of all nuclear weapons stocks.

Accord Encourages Netherlands

LD212015 Moscow TASS in English 1951 GMT 21 Nov 85

[Text] The Hague, November 21 TASS — The Dutch Government views the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit as encouraging A spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands said in a brief statement on behalf of the government that the outcome of the summit had lived up to the expectations. Our country, he said, thinks it positive that agreement was reached in Geneva on speeding up the process of the arms limitation talks, on the expansion of bilateral contacts between the USSR and the USA and on the next summit.

Sinowatz Endorses Regular Talks

LD211737 Moscow TASS in English 1651 GMT 21 Nov 85

[Text] Vienna, November 21 TASS — I am very glad that the summit meeeting has been held and I welcome sincerely the decision to hold such meetings regularly, expanding them at different levels, Fred Sinowatz, federal chancellor of the Republic of Austria, said in connection with the conclusion of the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva.

It is only regular talks that can lead to gradual overcoming of serious contradictions, Fred Sinowatz noted in a statement circulated by the APA news agency. Nobody expected immediate concrete results from this summit meeting, but the joint final statement contains numerous points meriting attention. Even general confirmation of the fact that an atomic war should not be waged and cannot be won is of much importance.

The federal chancellor said that the points of the statement which set out the intention of the sides to press for the reduction of the arsenals of nuclear weapons and for a ban on chemical weapons are a positive signal for world peace. What is most important, however, is a political impetus which will be made by the summit meeting, and the confirmation of the striving, despite all differences of opinion, to achieve common solutions, Fred Sinowatz said.

Marchais: 'Great Prospects'

LD211503 Moscow TASS in English 1436 GMT 21 Nov 85

[Text] Paris November, 21 TASS — Great importance of the Soviet-U.S. summit that ended in Geneva for the future of international relations was pointed out by General Secretary of the French Communist Party Georges Marchais. Addressing representatives of French intellectuals in the Parisian hall "Mutalite" Georges Marchais said that the bourgeois mass media try in every way to play down the importance of that meeting. But French Communists hold that the summit talks in Geneva open a constructive dialogue which has great prospects.

Mies Hopes for Continuation

LD212132 Moscow TASS in English 1825 GMT 21 NOV 85

[Text] Bonn, November 21 TASS — Together with millions of peace-minded people of this country we express hope that after the Geneva meeting the constructive search for mutually acceptable solution will be continued, Herbert Mies, chairman of the German Communist Party, stated in Dusseldorf today. In connection with the meeting between the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan that came to a close in Geneva he pointed out the need for reaching agreements consolidating mutual trust and aimed at the lessening of confrontation, at detente, nonmilitarization of space and the discontinuation of the arms race on earth. He also urged to step up the struggle for peace, security and disarmament.

Herbert Mies spoke out in support for peaceful cooperation between the East and the West. He urged the West German Government to stop pursuing the contradictory policy which blocked a further development of peaceful coexistence with socialist countries, to take constructive steps with a view to filling with concrete meaning the treaties with those countries. H. Mies assured the public that West German Communists would continue to do their utmost for a further consolidation of the peace movement.

Natta: 'Little More Hopeful'

LD212009 Moscow TASS in English 1948 GMT 21 Nov 85

[Text] Rome, November 21 TASS — No one expected, and with good reason, that the complicated and acute problems that have been accumulating for years would be solved during two days of the Geneva talks, Alessandro Natta, general secretary of the Italian Communist Party, has stated in an interview with the ITALIA news agency. It was important that both sides demonstrate the striving for resolving those problems in a frank and constructive spirit, he pointed out.

Today one can be a little more hopeful of the attaining of effective progress in the sphere of arms reduction, the lessening of international tension, the taking of concrete steps on the way to a political settlement of regional conflicts and the resumption of the policy of detente and cooperation on a worldwide scale.

WPC Head Sees 'Fresh Hope'

LD211928 Moscow TASS in English 1904 GMT 21 Nov 85

[Text] Sofia, November 21 TASS — The press conference by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev gave a fresh hope to people of good will and confidence of the morrow, President of the World Peace Council Romesh Chandra, staying here, said in an interview to TASS correspondent Yuriy Tysovskiy.

The summit meeting between the Soviet Union's and the United States' leaders in Geneva opened the way to a political dialogue on the main issue that agitates humanity — how to put an end to the arms race, avert nuclear war, prevent the militarization of space. Vast is the threat to peace. However, all who followed closely the press conference of the Soviet leader cannot fail to share the optimism he expressed. Not hiding the existing difficulties and problems, Mikhail Gorbachev noted a general trend of the onward movement. The World Peace Council shares this optimism, Romesh Chandra stressed.

Iranian Elements 'Openly' Want Talks To Fail

NC201333 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1700 GMT 19 Nov 85

[Vera Lebedeva commentary]

[Excerpts] Millions of people throughout the world have turned their eyes today to Geneva, where Mikhail Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and Ronald Reagan, President of the United States of America, are to meet. The outcome of this meeting will affect the future course of international events to a large extent. It will have a major impact on ways to curb the unprecedented arms race, to overcome the threat of a universal nuclear war, and to establish fruitful peace and cooperation throughout the world. The Soviet Union has gone to the Geneva summit with a whole range of peace-seeking initiatives and proposals. I am glad that Iran's workers also support these initiatives. The letters we receive from our listeners are proof of this.

However, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that some politicians and newspapers in Iran have taken a surprising stand. They openly want these talks to fail. They even allege that the Geneva meeting is contrary to the interests of developing countries and that the leaders of the two superpowers want to agree on how to carve the world up into areas of influence. Naturally, such allegations are meaningless and appear more so especially now that the fate of universal peace is in question. The opponents of the Geneva talks apparently forget that peace is necessary for all the countries of the world, especially for developing countries that have been liberated from the yoke of colonialism and imperialism and want to build a new life free from exploitation. The Iranian people, who are fed up with the 6 years of war with neighboring Iraq, are also well aware of the value of peace.

Therefore, allegations that the Geneva summit clashes with the interests of developing countries are obviously completely baseless. It is opposition to the finalization of Soviet-U.S. peace

accords that is truly contrary to the interests of countries and nations.

Those who have been talking for a long time now about imaginary collusion between the two superpowers and who equate our socialist country with the imperialist United States are the ones who want the Geneva talks to fail. I wish to take this opportunity to recall that the Soviet Union has never colluded with anyone and that the Soviet Union's foreign policy is principled and constructive. It is based on equality, respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity, nonintervention in domestic affairs, and the principles of peace, cooperation, and good-neighborliness. You in Iran are very well aware of this. It is to pursue these lofty principles that our country is participating in the current talks in Geneva.